

Y-W



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/628,570

07/29/2003

Eiji Hoshinaka

030924

4076

23850

7590

02/07/2005

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP
 1725 K STREET, NW
 SUITE 1000
 WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

CAO, ALLEN T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2652

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/628,570

Applicant(s)

HOSHINAKA ET AL.

Examiner

Allen T Cao

Art Unit

2652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2652

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The term “pick” in the specification, page 3, line 3 28 should be changed to –pickup--.

Appropriate correction is required.

2. The drawings are objected to because **numeral “5” in the figures seems to be the objective lens. It is not the pickup as recited in the specification.** Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 2652

3. Claim 4 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 3. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

4. Claim 9 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 8. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-2 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kato (US. 6,058,098).

Kato discloses a disk drive having a pickup feed mechanism comprising a slide member (14 including 15 and 16) holding a pickup 12 for recording and/or reproducing data on and from a disk-shaped recording medium D and configured to move the pickup in a radial direction of the disk-shaped recording medium; a feed screw 11 extending

Art Unit: 2652

parallel to a direction in which the slide member is moved; a rotation drive (19, 20) configured to rotate the feed screw; a joint (23 including 21 and 22) having two end portions, one end portion secured to the slide member (through screws 26 and through holes 15b, 16b and 23a) and the other end portion intersecting with a pivot of the feed screw and having one side set in engagement with the feed screw (figure 5); and a holding member (disk drive housing including chassis S) arranged in the position to prevent the joint from moving away from the screw portion of the feed screw, wherein the holding member is a case member which contains the pickup, the slide member, the feed screw, the rotation drive, and the joint as set forth in claims 1 and 6-7.

Regarding claim 2, Kato also discloses that the case member has a flat part (chassis S, figure 1); wherein the pickup 12, the slide member 14, the feed screw 11, the rotation drive (19, 20) and the joint (21-23) are arranged along the flat part.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3-5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Nishimura et al (US. 2003/0016616 A1).

Kato does not clearly disclose that the projection of the joint is configured to abut on the holding member as set forth in the claims.

Art Unit: 2652

Nishimura et al discloses a disk drive having a pickup feed mechanism comprising a joint (15 including a projection 17) attached to the chassis 6 and substantial inherently contacted (abut) to the bottom case 9 (see figures 2-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the structure of the projection of the joint of Kato such that the projection of the joint is configured to abut on the holding member as set forth, supra as inherently taught by Nishimura et al.

The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the structure of the projection of the joint of Kato such that the projection of the joint is configured to abut on the holding member as set forth, supra as inherently taught by Nishimura et al to improve a disk drive characteristics of thin, small, lightweight, inexpensive, highly accurate and highly reliable (see Nishimura et al, page 3, paragraph [0032]).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen T Cao whose telephone number is (703) 305-3796. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs (7:30 - 6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoa T Nguyen can be reached on (703) 305-9687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2652

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Allen Cao", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Allen Cao
Primary Examiner

AC
February 3, 2005